



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

96n  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,424	02/20/2001	Sung-II Park	8733.401.00	1944

30827 7590 11/06/2002

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

CHUNG, DAVID Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/785,424

Applicant(s)

PARK ET AL.

Examiner

David Chung

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: \*\*\*

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuya et al. (U.S. 6,081,310) in further view of Nakamura et al. (U.S. 6,124,911). Katsuya et al. discloses a reflection type liquid crystal display having a silver or silver alloy upper electrode layer. Note in figure 7, the reflective electrode layers 14 and 15 formed over an uneven insulating layer 12. Katsuya et al. teaches that the uneven surface of the resin insulating layer 12 can be formed by various methods including etching. See column 13, lines 10 – 15. Although Katsuya et al. does not specifically teach dry etching the insulating layer, it was well known and obvious to dry etch the insulating layer based on the background discussion and the disclosure of Nakamura et al. Nakamura et al. teaches using a dry etching method to form a step pattern in insulating film 9. See column 13, lines 18 – 25. Furthermore, the background discussion of Katsuya et al. teaches that wet etching is not as precise as dry etching. See column 3, lines 13 – 35. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: \*\*\*

skill in the art at the time of invention to dry etch the insulating surface of Katsuya et al. before forming the reflective electrode layers on top.

Claims 2-4, 6, 10, and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuya et al. (U.S. 6,081,310) in further view of Nakamura et al. (U.S. 6,124,911). SF<sub>6</sub>, O<sub>2</sub>, CF<sub>4</sub> and various combinations of these gases were conventionally used during dry etching processes. Benzocyclobutene was widely used for insulating layers in liquid crystal devices for its excellent transmission of visible light. Although Katsuya et al. is silent as to whether the contact hole in the insulation layer is formed before or after dry etching the surface, both methods were conventional for forming a reflective type display. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed gasses for dry etching, and to form the contact hole before dry etching, as these things were conventional at the time of invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Benzocyclobutene for the insulating layer since they provide excellent light transmission.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Chung whose telephone number is (703) 306-0155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

David Chung  
GAU 2871  
11/04/02



Kenneth Parker  
Primary Examiner  
GAU 2871